DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 258 054 CG 018 256

AUTHOR Kingsbury, Nancy M.
TITLE An Analysis of Communication Styles in Dual-Career Married Couples' Decision-Making Processes: Preliminary Results.
SPONS AGENCY Manitoba Univ., Winnipeg.
PUB DATE Oct 84
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Family Relations (San Francisco, CA, October 16-20, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Skills; *Decision Making; *Dual Career Family; Foreign Countries; Interpersonal Relationship; Negative Attitudes; *Sex Differences; *Spouses
IDENTIFIERS Canada; *Communication Styles

ABSTRACT

Decision-making in dual-career families is a salient issue due to the lack of societal norms for this type of family unit. A process-oriented model of joint decision making served as the basis for questionnaires and interviews used to study the predictive value of communication style on the outcomes of the decision making process in dual-career marriages. A sample of 51 dual-career couples (N=102) completed self-report questionnaires and a conjoint, tape-recorded interview. A process-power score for the couple was calculated by the response of each spouse to the other in conjunction with a score based on the saliency of the issue. The results indicated that wives used more acts of appeal than did husbands. Husband's use of appeal was the best predictor of subjective outcomes; the higher the acts of appeal, the more satisfactory were the subjective outcomes of decision making. Wive's use of rejecting acts was the second best predictor of subjective outcome; the higher the use of rejecting acts, the more resentful the subjective outcomes toward the decision making process for the couple. Wives who were much more nontraditional than husbands used more acts of appeal than wives where differences in self-role preferences were slight. These results suggest that communication styles influence the process of decision making and that acts of appeal and acts of rejection have the most influence. (NRB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED258054

AN ANALYSIS OF COMMUNICATION STYLES IN DUAL-CAREER MARRIED COUPLES' DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES:

Preliminary Results

by

Nancy M. Kingsbury, Ph.D.

Department of Family Studies

Faculty of Human Ecology

University of Manitoba

Winnipeg, Manitoba R3T 2N2

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Nancy M. Kingsbury

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CG 018256

This research was supported in part by a grant from the Research Board of the University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada R3T 2N2.

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for Family Relations, October, 1984.

Kingsbury, Nancy M. An Analysis of Communication Styles in Dual-Career Married Couples' Decision-Making Processes

Family therapists and researchers generally agree that communication patterns are of primary importance to those who concern themselves with family issues. Decision making in dual-career families is a salient issue due to the lack of societal norms which exist for this type of family unit. In the absence of "spontaneous consensus", nearly every aspect of dual-career family life requires the dynamics of the decision-making process. This decision-making process is facilitated by communication patterns. Consequently, in order to gain an accurate assessment of decision-making processes in dual-career families, a focus on communication patterns is both necessary and desirable.

The purpose of the study was to assess the predictive value of communication style on the outcomes of the process of decision making in dual-career marital dyads. The objectives were to test the following hypotheses:
a) communication style (cognitive acts, C1; resolving acts, C2; reconciling acts, C3; acts of appeal, C4; rejection, C5; and coercion, C6) will predict a significant proportion of the variance in process outcomes (PO) (consensus through conflict regulation) process power (PP), and subjective outcomes (SO) (feelings of satisfaction through resentment for the couple about the process outcomes of decision making. Differences (disparity scores) in husband and wives scores on several resource variables were entered into multiple regressions with communication styles in order to test the hypotheses.

The purposive sample consisted of 51 (N=101) dual-career couples. A process-oriented model of joint decision making served as a basis for the questionnaires and interviews used in the study. Data were gathered by

self-report questionnaires and a conjoint, tape-recorded interview. Communication style was assessed by the Raush et al. (1974) coding scheme for interpersonal conflict. Coders were trained to code the data by transcription of the tape-recorded conjoint interviews. Multiple coders were used to assure coder reliability.

A process-power score for the couple was calculated by the response of each spouse to the other in conjunction with a score based on the saliency of the issue. Process outcome was measured by spouse responses on a continuum from consensus to conflict regulation. Subjective outcome was measured by responses on a continuum from resentment to satisfaction.

Findings were as follows:

(a) Wives used significantly more acts of appeal than husbands.

(b) Husband's use of acts of appeal (HC4) was the best predictor of SO; the relationship was positive (the higher the husband's use of acts of appeal the more satisfactory were the subjective outcomes of decision making).

(c) Wife's use of rejecting acts was the second best predictor of SO; the relationship was negative (the higher the wife's use of rejecting acts, the more resentful the subjective outcomes toward the process of decision making for the couple).

(d) Wives who are much more nontraditional than husbands, use more acts of appeal than wives where differences in self-role preferences are slight.

Conclusions were that communication styles are a salient issue in the process of decision making and that acts of appeal and acts of rejection have the most influence on the subjective outcomes of dual-career decision making.

Family therapists and researchers generally agree that communication patterns are of primary importance to those who concern themselves with family issues. Bavelas and Segal (1982) pointed out that: "Most of our relations with others in society are based on and regulated by our communication with them . . . all communication defines, maintains or changes the nature of the relationship between communicants" (p. 105).

Research in the area of communication has largely focused on sequential analysis (Raush et al., 1974), lag sequential analysis (Krueger & Smith, 1982), and time-series analysis (Gottman, 1979). Krueger and Smith (1982) stated that: "the advantage of sequential studies is that they give more information about how the variables affect the decision-making process and also provide information on the structure of the process, which non-sequential analyses cannot" (p. 123). In other words, the coding of messages in sequences (speaker turns) in simulated role plays or actual discussion/negotiations about potentially conflictive situations such as occurs in decision-making provides the opportunity for the actual measurement of processes.

Gottman (1982) conducted a study with couples in which spouses tried to resolve a major conflict in the marriage. Conclusions were that: "The positive, relationship-enhancing aspects of a marriage, which I am calling 'friendship,' build the attachment and the affective bond that make couples willing to go through the difficult processes of relationship repair" (p.119).

Krueger and Smith (1982) researched the marital communication of four dual-career couples through the technique of decision-making role plays. The Raush et al. (1974) coding scheme of sequential analysis was used on the data. Findings most pertinent to the present study were that the dual-career couples had high marital satisfaction and used communication acts which involved supportive actions and expressions of agreement. These positive elements of communication served as a catalyst toward conflict resolution.

Building on a previous study of process power and decision outcomes in dual-career couples by the principle researcher (see Kingsbury, 1983 for full details), the present research adds a new dimension -- that of communication style of dual-career couples' decision-making processes. Whereas in the Kingsbury (1983) study an attempt was made to predict power and outcomes by a number of tangible and intangible resource variables, the primary purpose here is to add communication style to the resource variables to investigate what relationships exist among these variables and what influence communication style has on process power and decision outcomes. Theoretically based on the Scanzoni-Szinovacz (1980) model of decision making in which the disparity (difference between spouses) in resources is reasoned to be the influential factor in decision processes and outcomes, communication style is here treated as an additional resource possessed by spouses in the couples.

The purpose of the present study was to address the following research questions:

(a) Of the variables - sex-role disparity (SRD), marital satisfaction disparity (MSD), mutuality disparity (MUD), self-esteem disparity (SED), communication-style disparity (CSD), occupational disparity (OD), income disparity (IND), education disparity (ED), and length of marriage (LM), which are most predictive of the following dependent variables -- process power (PP), process outcome (PO), and subjective outcome (SO)?

(b) Of the six communication styles possible (C1 - neutral acts, C2 - resolution of conflict acts, C3 - interpersonal reconcilation acts, C4 - appealing acts, C5 - rejecting acts, C6 coercive acts) for husbands (HC1-HC6) and wives (WC1-WC6), which were most predictive of PP, PO and SO?

(c) Of the six communication styles listed above, where difference between spouses (disparity scores) are calculated, which communication style disparity score (husband higher use of act, equal use of act, wife higher use of act) is most predictive of PP, PO and SO?

(d) Do couples with differences on the following factors use different styles of communication (COM1-COM3) in the decision-making process?

Factors

1 - Sex role preference (SRP) disparities (SRD)

- small differences in spouses' scores on SRP - 1
- medium differences in spouses' scores on SRP - 2
- large differences in spouses' scores on SRP - 3

2 - Subjective outcome (SO) disparities (SOD)

- wife higher SO score than husband - 1
- equal SO scores for spouses - 2
- husband higher SO scores than wife - 3

3 - Mutuality Scores (MU) disparities (MUD)

- wife higher MU score than husband - 1
- equal MU scores for spouses - 2
- husband higher MU score than wife - 3

4 - Self-esteem (SE) disparities (SED)

- wife higher SE score than husband - 1
- equal SE scores for spouses - 2
- husband higher SE score than wife - 3

(e) Is there a significant difference in husbands and wives use of each of the six communication styles listed above?

LIST OF VARIABLES

Independent

1 - Education disparity - (ED);
wife's score subtracted from husband's score

2 - Occupation disparity - (OD) - Revised Duncan Occupational Scale (Stevens and Featherington, 1981)
wife's score subtracted from husband's score

3 - Income disparity - (IND) - wife's income subtracted from husband's

4 - Self-esteem disparity - (SED) - Rosenberg Scale (1965) - higher score indicated higher self-esteem. Wife's score subtracted from husband's.

5 - Sex-role disparity - (SRD) - Sex-role preference inventory (Scanzoni, 1980). Higher scores indicated nontraditional attitudes, while lower scores indicated traditional attitudes. Husband's score was subtracted from wife's score.

6 - Length of marriage - (LM) - number of years married to current spouse.

7 - Marital satisfaction - (MSD) - single response on continuum from completely satisfied to completely dissatisfied. Higher scores indicated high marital satisfaction. Wife's score was subtracted from husband's score.

8 - Mutuality disparity - (MUD) - indicated spouse's estimation of Other's previous: (a) cooperativeness, (b) trustworthiness, (c) fairness, and (d) empathy. Higher scores indicated high mutuality: lower scores represented lower mutuality. Wife's score was subtracted from husband's score.

9 - Communication style - The Rausch et al. (1974) coding scheme for interpersonal conflict was used. The six categories are presented in Table 1. Disparity score (DS1-CD6) - wive's scores were subtracted from husband's scores.

TABLE 1.

Six-category Coding Scheme for Interpersonal Conflict

Category	Description	
1 (C1)	Cognitive acts: neutral acts, suggestions, and rational arguments	(COM1) Cognitive
2 (C2)	Resolving acts: acts aimed at cooling the conflict or resolving the conflict issue	
3 (C3)	Reconciling acts: acts aimed at reconciling the two partners emotionally	(COM2) Affiliative
4 (C4)	Appealing acts: acts appealing to the other to grant one's wish	
5 (C5)	Rejecting acts: acts showing a cold or nasty rejection of the other's argument or person	
6 (C6)	Coercive acts or personal attacks: acts aimed at forcing compliance by power plays, guilt induction, or disparagement of the other	(COM3) Coercive

Raush, H., Barry, W., Hertel, R. and Swain M. (1974). Communication, Conflict and Marriage. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Dependent Variables

1 - Process Power - (PP) - relative ability of the members of the dyad to affect or resist change in relationship to the individual salience of the matter.

2 - Process Outcomes - (PO) - Possible outcome scores ranged from consensus to conflict regulation. Higher scores were indicative of the consensus end of the continuum.

3 - Subjective Outcome - (SO) - Subjective outcome scores ranged form satisfaction to resentment. Husbands' and wives' scores were added, with higher total scores indicative of high dyadic satisfaction and lower scores representative of dyadic resentment.

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The major strength of the study will be that it assesses the communication style used in the process of decision making. In addition, the use of tape-recorded interaction data will contribute to the accuracy of interpretation. Verbatim transcriptions of recorded interviews will reduce problems of instrumentation to a minimum.

The primary limitation of the study will be the non-random nature of the sample. The fact that all wives in the study were members of a professional women's club may have created biases. Appropriate caution should be taken in the generalization of findings.

METHODS

A purposive sample of 51 (n=102) upper-middle class married, wives were contacted through membership in a professional business women's group. Only those women who were married and currently living with spouse were asked to participate. In accord with Rapoport and Rapoport's (1978) definition of dual-career couples, other criteria for participation were that both spouses had a high level of continuous commitment to a professional career.

Letters of orientation were sent to the eligible couples. In order to set up a date for the couple interview, interviewers initiated contact by telephone approximately one week after the letters were mailed.

Range of ages was from 27 year to 65 years (x = 40 years). Of the subjects 18 (36%) of husbands and 19 (37%) wives reported one previous marriage. Years married ranged from one to 38 years (x = 12.7 years).

Twenty-five couples had from one to five children under 18 years of age currently living with them (x = 1.32 children). Highest educational levels of husbands were: a) high school diploma, two (2%); b) some college, seven (14%); c) college degree, 17 (33%); d) some graduate work or master's degrees, 15

(30%); and e) law, medical, or Ph.D. degrees, ten (20%). Wives educational levels were: a) high school diploma, two (4%); b) some college, four (8%); c) college degree, 20 (39%); d) some graduate work or master's degree, 16 (31%); and e) law, medical, or Ph.D. degree, nine (14%).

According to the Duncan Index, occupational rank covered a range from 24 to 87 (mean = 66.07 for husbands and 65.91 for wives). Among wives, 76 percent held occupational levels above the 56 level, which indicated professional-type careers. Seventy-three percent of husbands held occupations above the 56 professional level.

The number of hours worked ranged from 25 hours to 70 hours. The majority of both spouses (mean for husbands = 47.0 hours; mean for wives = 47 hours) worked 40 to 50 hours per week. Average income for wifes was $25-30,000 and for husbands $35-40,000. Husbands earned approximately 27 percent more income than wives.

Data Collection

Data were collected by self-report questionnaires and conjoint, tape-recorded interviews in participants' homes. The first step in the collection procedure was the completion by both spouses of a confidential questionnaire designed to measure sex-role preference, self-esteem, mutuality, marital satisfaction, length of marriage, income, education, and occupation. Subjects were instructed to go to separate rooms to complete the instrument and to refrain from communication about questions or answers.

After the questionnaires were completed, the couple rejoined the interviewer for the structured conjoint tape-recorded interview in which the process of decision making was assessed. The final stage of the procedure was for spouses to complete the closing questionnaire separately and privately which served as indicators of subjects' subjective feelings about the process of decision making and their perceived outcomes.

Research Instruments and Measures

A process-oriented model of joint decision making was presented by Scanzoni and Polonko (1980) and Scanzoni and Szinovacz (1980) and used as a research instrument by Hill (1981). The model is dynamic in that it is based on Gulliver's (1979) notions of the repetitive cyclical and developmental sequences of negotiations. Within the model information exchange and assessment aid negotiation to move forward toward consensus and implementation. (For a complete illustration of the model and research instruments see Kingsbury, 1983).

In the present study a structured conjoint interview was based on the cyclical and developmental sequences of the joint decision-making model. Figure 1 illustrates the units and steps of the decision-making model.

INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

The following discussion outlines the coding, measurement, and calculation of process power. Units I and II (see Figure 2) were used to assess the final process power score for the dyad. In steps one and two the initiator (Actor) makes a request or expresses a point of view. Response of Other in step five in relationship to Actor's request was used as the indicator of the process power score in Unit I for Actor. If Other's response in step five is yes (agreement with Actor), code +1, +2, or +3 (Numerals 1, 2 and 3 represent the importance Actors place on the point of view; 1 indicates only somewhat important; 2, important and 3, very important).

INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE

If Other's response is "Yes, but" and Actor made at least a partial gain, code +1, +2, or +3, according to the importance Actor placed on the matter. If Other responds "Yes, but" and no evidence exists that Actor made any gain,

code -1, -2, or -3. If Other responds "No," the Actor has made no gain and the code is -1, -2, or -3.

Step two is comprised of Other's proposition and Actor's response. The unit steps and coding are identical to that in unit I. So few couples had units II and IV which were discernable that the study used only units I and II for each couple.

Total Process-Power Score

As a result of a sum of the Unit I and II (above) scores, a single score for husband and wife as either Actor or Other was produced. The wife's score was then subtracted from the husband's score which resulted in a total process-power score for the dyad. Higher positive scores indicated process power in favor of the husband and lower negative scores represented process power in favor of the wife. Asymmetrical power (unequal power) existed when the process-power score deviated from zero. The farther from zero, the greater the degree of asymmetry. Zero scores were indicative of symmetrical power (equal power). (For a step-by-step method for scoring and coding process power, see Kingsbury, 1983.)

Communication Style

Two independent coders listened to each tape recorded interview and rated each spouse by the numbers of communication acts (Rasch et al., 1974) used. Inter-coder reliability was .90 - .95.

HYPOTHESES

Process Power

H_1

(a) Among the predictors investigated (see purpose (a), p.2 for variable list), sex-role disparity and affiliative communication disparities in reconciling acts (C3) and appealing acts (C4) will predict the largest portion of the variance in process power.

b - Resolution of conflict will be the best predictor of process outcome.

c - Rejection will be the best predictor of subjective outcome.

Rationale for H_1

(a) In a previous study with the same data, Kingsbury (1983) found sex-role disparity to be the best predictor of process power. According to Raush et al. (1974), some empirical confirmation has been found that power in relationships is related to trusting behavior. Reconciling acts and appealing acts are here considered cooperative behaviors and therefore differences in them are expected to predict process power.

(see rationale for H_2 (b) and (c) for similar rationales for PO and SO.)

H_2

Among the variables investigated (see purpose (b), p.3 for variable list;

(a) rejecting acts (C5) will be the best predictor of process power.

(b) resolving acts (C2) will be the best predictor of process outcome.

(c) rejecting acts (C5) and acts of appeal (C4) will be the best predictor of subjective outcome.

Rationale for H_2

(a) According to Raush et al. (1974), the more powerful person in the couple can afford to be cooperative. At the same time the less powerful spouse may be less motivated toward cooperation and consequently more rejecting.

(b) It is assumed that spouses who use resolving type acts are more likely to work toward conflict resolution than those who do not use resolving acts.

(c) It is assumed that spouses who use rejection would be less satisfied with the outcomes of decision making. In other words, spouses who were coerced would have less feelings of satisfaction.

H_3

Among the variables investigated (see purpose (c), p. 3 for variable list):

(a) disparities in the use of rejecting acts (C5) will be the best predictor of process power.

(b) disparities in the use of resolving acts (C2) and rejecting acts (C5) will be the best predictor of process outcome.

(c) disparities in the use of rejecting acts (C5) and acts of appeal (C4) will be the best predictor of subjective outcome.

Rationale for H_3

same as H_2.

H_4

In couples where large differences in sex role preferences exist, wives will use more affiliative acts (COM4) than in couples where sex role preferences are equal or of small difference.

Rationale for H_4

In a previous study with the present data, Kingsbury (1983) found that in all cases where great differences in sex-role preferences existed, wives had higher (more nontraditional) scores than husbands. Scanzoni and Szinovacz (1980) pointed out that individuals with modern sex-role preferences use less coercive strategies and more positive supportive acts. Because the number of potential conflicts is increased in couples where great differences exist in sex-role preferences, it is assumed that wives in that situation would need to use increased numbers of affiliative acts to win their positions.

H_6

Husbands and wives who have high feelings of satisfaction (subjective outcome) about their decision making will have spouses who use low amounts of coercive acts (COM3).

Rationale for H_6

Not only are subjective outcomes related to prior decision making but also to subsequent decision making. It is logical to assume that couple members who have rejecting spouses will have little chance to perceive themselves as satisfied in present or future decision making.

H_7

Where mutuality scores are equal for spouses, low coercion acts (COM3) will be used by spouses.

Rationale for H_7

According to Scanzoni and Szinovacz (1980), persons who are high in mutuality view their partners as trustworthy, fair, etc. (In this sample almost all couples with equal mutuality scores had high scores.) It is difficult to be rejecting with one's spouse when one perceives that partner to be fair and just.

H_8

Husbands or wives with higher self-esteem than spouse will use more affiliative acts.

Rationale for H_8

People with high self-esteem ask for what they want (Scanzoni & Szinovacz, 1980). Therefore, those with high self-esteem will appeal to other (C4) and use reconciling acts (C5) more than spouses with low self-esteem.

Data Analysis

The multiple regression technique was used to determine the best predictor among the previously listed independent variables of the dependent variables. In order to test the hypotheses, a separate regression was run for each of the dependent variables.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed on the data for husbands' and wives' communication styles by: a) power, b) sex-role preference, c) subjective outcome, d) mutuality scores, and e) self-esteem. Scheffe's test (alpha level .05) was used as a posterior contrast test to specify group mean differences.

RESULTS

The mean for FO was 2.3 which indicated that the average score on the continuum of decision-making outcomes was between discussion or negotiation continuing and agree to disagree.

The positive PP score (mean = 1.18) indicated that husbands had a slight advantage in the power arena. The SO mean of 91.2 was representative of high satisfaction scores for the couple as a unit. SRD scores (mean - 4.16) were indicative of wives' more modern attitudes toward sex roles than husbands.

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

The mean of wives' SRD scores was 36.23 and husbands' mean scores were 31.01. These scores suggest that both husbands and wives were more nontraditional than traditional. In each case where differences existed between husbands and wives on sex role preferences, wives were more nontraditional than husbands.

Wives held higher educational levels by a small margin (mean - 0.20) while husbands had an equally small margin of higher occupational status (mean = 0.19). Higher incomes were reported by husbands (IND mean = 2.07) and wives reported higher self-esteem scores (SED mean = -1.90). Mean scores on marital satisfaction were almost equal for husbands (4.686) and wives (4.765), and were high for both. Mutuality disparities were small (MUD = -.46) with wives expressing more feelings of mutuality towards husbands than vice versa.

Communication variables

Table 2 contains the correlations for all variables which were at least correlated by 45. The most highly correlated (r = .93) were wife cognitive acts (WC1) and husbands cognitive act (HC1). The relationship was positive. Husbands who scored high on cognitive acts (HC1) also scored high on resolution of conflict acts (HC2, r = .48). The use of resolution acts (C2) was correlated (r = .53) for husbands and wives. The positive relationship between wife's use of coercion (WCOM3) and husbands use of rejection (HC5) had an r of .52. The positive relationship between rejection disparity (CD5) scores and SRD suggested that wives high in use of rejection (WS5) are much higher on SRD than husbands (wives more nontraditional).

T tests were run to determine if husbands and wives differed significantly on use of the six communication categories. The only significant variables were husband and wife use of acts of appeal (C4). Wives ($\bar{x}$ = 3.63) were significantly more likely to use acts of appeal (C4) than husbands ($\bar{x}$ = 2.78).

TABLE 2

Correlation Table - Variables with Correlations = >.45

	HC1	HC2	HC5	HSO	WSO	WMU	SRD
HC1		.48					
WC1	.93						
WC2		.53					
WC5				-.46	-.50		
WC6			.52			-.51	
COMD5							.46

HC1-HC6	Husbands communication style (see Table 1)
WC1-WC6	Wives communication style (see Table 1)
HSO	Husband subjective outcome score
WSO	Wife subjective outcome score
WMU	Wife mutuality score
SRD	Sex role disparity score
MUD	Mutuality disparity score
COMD5	Rejection disparity score
COMD6	Coercion disparity score

Test of Hypotheses

H_1 Separate regressions were run for each of the dependent variables, PP, PO and SO. The overall F for PO and PP were not significant, therefore they are not reported. The independent variables listed in H_1 taken together yielded a multiple R of .69 which explains .49 percent of the variance of SO (See Appendix A) Overall, F was significant at the .02 level. Communication style disparity (CD4, acts of appeal) was the only variable with a significant T score ($\beta = .27$; $p<.05$). CD4 was positively related to SO which indicated that the higher the CD4 (husband used acts of appeal more than wife), the higher the SO (couple feels satisfied toward the outcomes of decision making). Therefore, H_1 was rejected.

H_2

The overall F for PP and PO were non-significant and not herein reported. All of the communication styles (HC1-HC6; WC1-WC6) for husbands and wives separately were entered into a multiple regression analysis with subjective outcome as the dependent variable. In Appendix B the results of this analysis are presented. The communication style variables taken together yielded a multiple R of .68, which explains .47 percent of the variance in subjective outcome. Overall F was significant at the .01 level. The best predictor of SO was WC5 (wife's use of rejection) (β = .57; T = $p<.0006$). WC5 was negatively related to SO which indicated that in couples where wife's use of rejection was low the couple had more satisfactory feelings about the outcomes of decision making. The second best predictor of SO was HC4 (husband's use of acts of appeal) (β = .36; T = $p<.04$). HC4 was positively related to SO which indicated that husbands who used acts of appeal (HC4) with high frequency were members of couples with satisfactory feelings toward the outcomes of decision making. Hence, parts (a) and (b) of H_2 were rejected and H_2 (c) was accepted.

H_3

A forward regression was run on the dependent variables SO, PP and PO, with the communication style disparity scores (CD1-CD6); the following results were obtained. The overall F for PO was nonsignificant and is not reported. For the dependent variable, process power, the only variable which met the criteria for entry into the equation was CD5 (difference in acts of rejection used by spouses) (β = .35; $p<.01$). Multiple R was .35 which explained .1[illegible] percent of the variance in process power. CD5 was negatively related to PP which indicates that the higher the CD5 score of the couple (husband uses more rejecting acts than wife), the higher the wife's power and the lower the CD5 score (wife uses more rejecting acts than husband) the higher the husbands power. In other words, wives and husbands use less rejection when they have the power and more rejection when they do not have the power.

For the dependent variable, SO, two variables met the criteria for entry into the equation. The best predictor of SO was CD5 (β = .37; $p<.005$) (differences in acts of appeal) and CD5 (β = .32; $p<.01$) (differences in rejection). Multiple R for the equation was .50 which explained .25 percent of the variance in SO. CD4 was positively related to SO which indicated that when husbands use more acts of appeal (HC4) to other to grant one's wise than wives, the feelings of satisfaction of the couple (SO) toward their decision making is higher and when wives use more acts of appeal than husbands the SO of decision making is more toward the resentful end of the continuum. CD5 was positively related to SO, therefore, the interpretation is that when wives use more acts of rejection (WC5) than husbands, subjective outcomes are more resentful, and when husbands use more acts of rejection (HC5) than wives subjective outcomes are more satisfactory.

H_4-H_8

A one-way analysis of variance was applied to determine the relationship between the types of communication style (HCOM1-3; WCOM1-3) used by husbands and wives separately, and the variables, sex-role preferences disparities*, subjective outcome disparities, mutuality disparities and self-esteem disparities. No significant difference were found for the subjective outcome and self-esteem groups tested. Therefore H_6 and H_8 were rejected.

Table 3 reports the means and standard deviations on wife affiliative communication style (WCOM2) for the three groups of sex-role preference disparities. Group one (N=18) had a mean WCOM2 of 8.78; Group two (N=18) had a mean WCOM2 of 10183; Group three (N=14) had a mean WCOM2 of 13.79. The total mean for all groups was 10.92. Table 4 presents the one-way analysis of variance of mean WCOM2 for the groups. Results indicated that there was a significant difference of WCOM2 for the three groups, and the null hypothesis was rejected and H_4 was accepted. The Scheffe test was applied with the result that Groups one and three had a significantly different ($p<.05$) WCOM2 score.

TABLE 3

Wife Affiliative Communication Style*
Means and Standard Deviations for Sex-role Disparities,
Groups One, Two and Three

Groups**	N	Mean	SD
Group One[1]	18	8.78	2.90
Group Two	18	10.83	3.60
Group Three[1]	14	13.79	6.22
Totals	50	10.92	4.65

*Affiliative acts include "resolution of conflict acts", reconciling acts", and "appealing acts".

**Group One - small difference in sex-role preference scores of husband and wife
Group Two - medium difference in sex-role preference scores of husband and wife
Group Three - large differences in sex-role preference scores of husband and wife

[1]Scheffe Test - Groups Three and One were significantly different

Within couples where there are large differences in SRP (in all cases women are more nontraditional), wives use more affiliative acts than where couples have small SRP differences.

In Table 5 the means and standard deviations for WCOM3 (coercive acts) and the three mutuality disparity groups are reported. Group One (N=19) had mean WCOM3 of 2.32; Group Two (N=14) had a mean WCOM3 of 2.00; Group Three had a mean WCOM5 of 4.17. The total mean for the groups was 2.71. Table 6 presents the one-way analysis of variance of mean WCOM3 for the groups. Results indicated that there was a significant difference of WCOM3 for the three groups, therefore H_7 was accepted (only for the wife).

TABLE 4
Analysis of Variance of Mean Wife Coercive Communication Style
for Groups One, Two and Three

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between Groups	35.47	2	17.74	4.34*
Within Groups	171.77	42	4.09	
Totals	207.24	44		

*$p<.02$

TABLE 5
Wife Coercive Communication Style* Means and Standard Deviations
for Mutuality Disparities, Groups One, Two and Three

Groups**	N	Mean	SD
Group One	19	2.32	1.49
Group Two[1]	14	2.00	1.92
Groups Three[1]	12	4.17	2.76
Totals	45	2.71	2.17

*Coercive Acts include "rejection", "guilt induction", "attack".

**Group One - Wife higher mutuality than husband
Group Two - Equal mutuality
Group Three - Husband higher mutuality than wife

[1]Scheffe Test - Groups Three and One were significantly different.

The Scheffe test was applied and Groups Two and Three had a significantly different ($p<.05$) WCOM3 score. In couples where husband has higher mutuality score than wife, wives use more "coercive acts" than wives in couples where mutuality scores are the same.

TABLE 6
Analysis of Variance of Mean Wife Affiliative Communication Style
for Groups One, Two and Three

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between Groups	198	2	99	5.37*
Within Groups	866	47	18	
Totals	1063	49		

*$p<.008$

DISCUSSION

Due to the preliminary nature of the results of the study, discussion will be limited until further analysis. In accord with the notions of Scanzoni and Szinovacz (1980) the dual-career wives in the study had highly nontraditional sex-role preferences, and where large disparities in couples sex-role preferences existed, the wife was always the more nontraditional of the two. Overall both husbands and wives were more nontraditional than traditional.

Kingsbury (1983) found that MUD and SRD were the best predictors of SO. In the present study in which CD was added to the independent variables of the previous study, difference in CD4 (acts of appeal) was the best and only significant predictor of subjective outcome. The positive direction of the relationship suggested that when husbands use more acts of appeal that the couple is more satisfied with the outcomes of decision making. On the other hand, if wives use more acts of appeal and husbands less, the subjective outcomes are more resentful. When a separate regression was run with husband and wife communication style variables entered separately, husband's C4 (acts of appeal) was indicated to be significant to SO, but wife's acts of appeal score was nonsignificant. T tests revealed that the only variable for which husbands and wives had significantly different means was C4 (acts of appeal). Wives use more acts of appeal than husbands. The calculation of the SO variable presents some problem in interpretation of these findings. SO is the sum of husbands and wives scores on SO. Consequently, when husbands use more acts of appeal and SO is high (satisfactory), one is unable to accurately state whether the husband's or wife's SO score is causing the increase. One could interpret this finding to suggest that when husbands use more appeal husbands, wives, or both have higher SO. Further analysis needs to be done to determine which SO of the three SO scores just mentioned are changing. It

seems likely that husbands' acts of appeal were more influential to SO than wife's acts of appeal.

The finding that if wife uses high rejection, SO for couple was more resentful and if wife uses low rejection, SO for the couple was more satisfactory supports the findings of Raush et al. (1974) that the more powerful person in a couple can afford to be cooperative. At the same time the less powerful spouse may be less motivated toward cooperation and consequently more rejecting.

CONCLUSION

The results of this study indicate that the communication acts -- appeal and rejection - are the most influential in the subjective outcomes of decision making. According to the Scanzoni and Szinovacz (1980) model of decision making subjective outcome is a salient issue for subsequent decision making. Therefore, one concludes that within dual-career couples where wife's use of rejection is low and husbands use of appeals is high the subjective outcomes of decision making are satisfactory and this satisfaction will have a positive influence on future decision making.

REFERENCES

Bavelas, Janet B., & Segal, Lynn (1982). "Family systems theory. Background and implications." Journal of Communications, 32, 86-201.

Gottman, J. (1979). Marital interaction. New York: Academic Press (1982).

Gottman (1982). "Emotional Responsiveness in Marital Conversations". Journal of Communications, 32, 108-119.

Kingsbury, N. (1983). An assessment of decision-making processes in dual-career marriages. Unpublished Dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Krueger, Dorothy L., & Smith, Patricia (1982). Decision-making patterns of couples: A sequential analysis. Journal of Communications, 32, 121-133.

Raush, Harold D., Barry, William A., Hertel, Richard K., & Swain, Mary Ann (1974). Communication conflict and marriage. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Scanzoni, J. (1980). "Contemporary marriage types". Journal of Family Issues, 1, 125-150.

Scanzoni, John, & Szinovacz, M. (1980). Family decision-making: A developmental sex-role model. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Appendix A Multiple Regression Analysis H_1

Variables	B	Beta	T
LM	-.12986	-.10515	-.686
DC2	-.47701	-.13723	-1.049
IND	1.06506	.23879	1.657
DC4	1.58440	.26853	2.013**
DC3	-.18096	-.03796	-.279
DC5	1.82032	.17629	1.205
MSD	1.61426	.20042	1.497
ED	-.29315	-.15471	-1.150
DC6	.66976	.09556	.616
DC1	.04674	.01490	.106
OD	.02180	.03234	.207
MUD	-.09916	-.19670	-1.297
ED	-.03627	-7.483E-03	-.048
SRD	.55897	.30697	1.932
(CONSTANT)	89.86791		

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Regression	14	3778.66603	269.90472	2.36113*
Residual	36	4115.22034	114.31168	

*p<.02 Multiple R = .69187 R Square = .47868
**p<.05 Standard Error = 10.69166

Appendix B Multiple Regression Analysis H_2

Variable	B	Beta	T
WRC6	-.51939	-.06803	-.438
HRC2	.27271	.08824	.483
HRC6	-1.60140	-.15042	-1.062
HRC3	.27843	.05312	.325
WRC4	-.96306	-.14780	-1.005
WRC5	-5.85041	-.56659	-3.753*
WRC3	3.08453E-03	5.939E-04	.004
HRC4	2.42982	.35932	2.182***
HRC5	-1.67382	-.11010	-.657
WRC1	.18729	.15555	.458
WRC2	-.25295	-.06424	-.370
HRC1	-.01282	-.01056	-.029
(CONSTANT)	93.74364		

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Regression	12	3599.67453	299.97288	-
Residual	38	4294.21183	133.00557	2.65450**

*p<.0006 Multiple R = .67528 R Square = .45601
**p<.01 Standard Error = 10.63041
***p<.04

Figure 1

Unit I

1. Initiator (who raises the issue)

2. Substantive point (what is being said; proposition made, etc.)

3. Supporting actions (strategies used to support the position)

4. Importance of position to party speaking

5. Response of Other
   A. "Yes" (Discovery of consensus; Unit I ends.)
   B. "Yes, but" (Development of consensus) Go to Unit II
   C. "No" (Conflict)

Unit II

2. What is being said by Other

3. Supporting actions by Other

4. Importance of position to Other

5. Response of initiating spouse

   A. If "yes," unit ends.
   B. If "yes, but," units continue.
   C. If "no," units continue.

Source: Adapted from Scanzoni and Szinovacz, 1980, pp. 54, 56; Hill, 1981, p. 40.

Figure 3. Process-variable units.

Figure 2

Process Power

Unit I

Steps 1 and 2 - Initiator (Actor) makes request

Step 5 - Response of Other

If "yes," Code +1, +2, or +3 for Actor. Code 0 if no request for change was made, or no solution offered.
If "yes, but" (Actor made at least a partial gain) Code +1, +2, or +3.
If "yes, but" (Actor made no gain) Code -1, -2, or -3.
If "no," (No gain for Actor) Code -1, -2, -3.

Unit II

Step 2 - Other offered proposition.

Step 4 - Importance of matter (Code 1 - only somewhat important; Code 2 - important; Code 3 - very important)

Step 5 - Response of Actor
If "yes," Code +1, +2, +3 for Other
Code 0 if no request for change was made, or no solution offered.
If "yes, but," (Other made at least a partial gain) Code +1, +2, or +3.

Step 4 - Importance of matter*
Code 1 - Only somewhat important
Code 2 - Important
Code 3 - Very important

If "yes, but," (Other made no gain) Code -1, -2, or -3.
If "no," (No gain for Other) Code -1, -2, or -3.